

## **REMARKS**

Applicants will address each of the Examiner's objections and rejections in the order in which they appear in the Office Action.

### **Claim Objections**

In the Office Action, the Examiner objects to Claims 24 and 25 for an informality. In particular, the Examiner objects to the phrase in Claim 24 of "said at least one of said second source and drain regions." Accordingly, in order to advance the prosecution of this application, Applicants are amending Claim 24 as follows: "[[said]] at least one of said second source and drain regions." This should overcome the Examiner's objection, and it is respectfully requested that the objection be withdrawn.

### **Claim Rejections - 35 USC §102**

The Examiner also rejects Claims 14, 16, 17, 19, 21, 22, 24 and 25 under 35 USC §102(e) as being anticipated by Yamazaki (US 6,909,114). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

While Applicants traverse this rejection, in order to advance the prosecution of this application, Applicants are amending independent Claims 14, 19 and 24 to recite that the claimed invention is directed to a ferroelectric liquid crystal display. As the Examiner admits in the Office Action, Yamazaki does not disclose that the liquid crystal is a ferroelectric liquid crystal. Accordingly, independent Claims 14, 19 and 24, and those claims dependent thereon, cannot be anticipated by Yamazaki. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Further, as explained below, Yamazaki is disqualified under 35 USC §103(c) as prior art in a

rejection under 35 USC §103(a). Hence, it is respectfully requested that independent Claims 14, 19 and 24, and those claims dependent thereon, now be allowed.

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC §103

The Examiner also rejects Claims 1-4, 6-9, 11 and 12 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamazaki. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicant respectfully submits that Yamazaki is disqualified under 35 USC §103(c) as prior art in a rejection under 35 USC §103(a). In particular, 103(c)(1) states:

“Subject matter developed by another person, which qualifies as prior art only under one or more of subsections (e), (f), and (f) of section 102 of this title, shall not preclude patentability under this section where the subject matter and the claimed invention were, at the time the claimed invention was made, owned by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person.”

In this case, the Examiner is citing Yamazaki as a §102(e) reference. Both the present application and Yamazaki are owned by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person (i.e. Semiconductor Energy Laboratory Co., Ltd.).

Therefore, since Yamazaki is viewed as subject matter developed by another person (Yamazaki.; the present application is to Yamazaki et al.) which qualifies as prior art only under §102(e) and the subject matter of Yamazaki and the claimed invention are owned by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person, Yamazaki shall not preclude patentability under §103.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Information Disclosure Statement

Applicants are submitting an information disclosure statement (IDS) herewith. It is respectfully requested that this IDS be entered and considered prior to the issuance of any further action on this application.

Conclusion

It is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and should be allowed.

If any fee should be due for this amendment, please charge our deposit account 50/1039.

Favorable reconsideration is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: *July 11, 2006*



\_\_\_\_\_  
Mark J. Murphy  
Registration No. 34,225

COOK, ALEX, McFARRON, MANZO,  
CUMMINGS & MEHLER, LTD.  
200 West Adams Street, Suite 2850  
Chicago, Illinois 60606  
(312) 236-8500

Customer no. 26568